



I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail No. EV670649916US, in an envelope addressed to: MS Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Dated: October 11, 2005

Signature: Sandy Reisman
Sandy Reisman

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: STEVE BECK *ET AL.*
APPLICATION NO.: 09/721,441
FILED: NOVEMBER 22, 2000
FOR: **DYNAMICALLY TARGETING ONLINE
ADVERTISING MESSAGES TO USERS**

EXAMINER: J. D. CARLSON
ART UNIT: 3622
CONF. No: 2327

Reply Brief

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

reply brief
noted
12/22/05

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.41

Sir:

This reply brief is in response to the Examiner's Answer dated August 11, 2005.

I. REPLY TO ANSWER

A. **Reply to Examiner's answer concerning claim 15 and 30**

On page 10 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner states the following:

Applicant argues that none teach a first satisfied condition. The conditions are applied sequentially and any TRUE condition would trigger a random subgroup ad; this would occur for the first TRUE condition.

Appellants respectfully disagree. Claim 15 recites "a treatment subgroup" that indicates "which of a plurality of advertising treatments will be applied when the condition is the first condition in the sequence of conditions to be satisfied." Similarly, claim 30 recites